Rle

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,440	09/05/2003	Veshaal Singh	50277-2209	8474

29989	7590	02/13/2006		EXAMINER

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

	EXAMINER
	PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,440	SINGH, VESHAAL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on September 5,

2003.

2.   Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1 and 17-32 are independent claims.

Priority

3.   Acknowledgement is made to applicant's claim for priority to U.S. Provisional

Application Serial No. 60/416306, filed on October 4, 2002.

Drawings

4.   The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on September 5, 2003.

Specification

5.   The Abstract is objected to because it exceeds 150 words.

6.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the
disclosure.

        The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single
paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that
the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract
on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology
often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The
abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether
there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

        The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information
given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

7.   Claims 17-32 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear

weather the claims are in Independent or dependent claim format. For example claim 17

describes a computer readable medium that performs a method of claim 1. However

claims 1-16 are method claims and 17-32 describe a computer readable medium. If

claim 17 is a computer readable medium claim then it should be an independent claim

and anything describing another claim in the independent claim should be avoided. All

the limitations of claim 1 should be entered into independent claim 17 describing the

computer readable medium, by stating "performing the method recited in claim 1" is

inappropriate. Claims 17-32 are currently being treated as Independent claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9.   Claim 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raise a question as

to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a

technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application

producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject

matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. This rejection can be overcome by simply stating that the
method is being performed in a computer: example "A computer-Implemented method
for generating a mapping scheme".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that
form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
> by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
> title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

11.   Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lau
(U.S. Pub 2002/0184213, filed April 25, 2002).

Regarding Independent claims 1 and 17, Lau discloses *a method for*
generating a mapping scheme, the method comprising:

- *Reading source data definition that includes information about*
  attributes of a source (paragraphs 13-17 & 52 & abstract, wherein
  source data that includes attribute information is read);

- *Reading target data definition that includes information about*
  attributes of a target (paragraphs 13-17 & 52 & abstract, wherein
  target data that includes attribute information is read);

- *Receiving commands from a user, wherein said commands establish a mapping between one or more attributes of said source and one or more attributes of said target* (paragraphs 13-17 & 52 & abstract, wherein user input is received to establish a mapping between one or more attributes of source and target); *and*

- *Based on said commands, automatically generating a mapping scheme that represents said mapping, wherein said mapping includes at least one of multiple attributes of said source mapped to a single attribute of said target* (paragraphs 13-17 & 52 & abstract, wherein more than one attribute of source or target is mapped to a single attribute of either); *and*

- *Multiple attributes of said target mapped to a single attribute of said source* (paragraphs 52 & 64, wherein more than one attribute of source or target is mapped to a single attribute of either).

Regarding Dependent claims 2 and 18, Lau discloses *using said mapping scheme to create an electronic document with data from said source, wherein the electronic document has a particular format dictated by the target data definition* (paragraphs 14, 47, 52 & 94).

Regarding Dependent claims 3 and 19, Lau discloses *using said mapping scheme to store, into said target, data from an electronic document, wherein the*

electronic document has a particular format dictated by the source data definition
(paragraphs 14, 47, 52 & 94).

Regarding Dependent claims 4 and 20, Lau discloses *wherein said mapping
scheme further includes instructions on how to collapse a number of attributes of
said source into a smaller number of attributes of said target* (paragraph 44).

Regarding Dependent claim 5 and 21, Lau discloses *wherein said mapping
scheme further includes instructions on how to expand a number of attributes of
said source to a greater number of attributes of said target* (paragraph 44).

Regarding Dependent claims 6 and 22, Lau discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving
  user input that specifies a condition, and an action associated with
  the condition (paragraph 85); and*
- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation
  that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from
  the source to a format associated with the target (paragraph 85);*
- *During performance of said operation, performing the steps of
  determining whether the condition is satisfied (paragraph 85); and*
- *If the condition is satisfied, then performing said action (paragraph
  85).*

Regarding Dependent claims 7 and 23, Lau discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that specifies a specific set of instructions* (paragraph 85); *and*

- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target* (paragraph 85); *and*

- *During performance of said operation, executing the specific set of instructions to affect said operation* (paragraph 85).

Regarding Dependent claims 8 and 24, Lau discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that declares a variable to which values can be assigned* (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53);

- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target* (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53); *and*

- *During performance of said operation, using said variable (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53).*

Regarding Dependent claims 9 and 25, Lau discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that specifies a precompiled routine (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53); and*

- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53); and*

- *During performance of said operation, calling said precompiled routine to affect said operation (Paragraphs 48, 45, 49, 51 and 53).*

Regarding Dependent claims 10 and 26, Lau discloses wherein:

- *The attributes of said source correspond to a number of hierarchical levels (paragraphs 79 & 83);*

- *The attributes of said target correspond to a number of hierarchical levels (paragraphs 79 & 83); and*

- *The method further comprises the step of receiving user input that establishes a mapping between one or more hierarchical levels of said source and one or more hierarchical levels of said target*

(paragraphs 79 & 83).

Regarding Dependent claims 11 and 27, Lau discloses *wherein said mapping scheme includes instructions on how to collapse a number of hierarchical levels of said source into a smaller number of hierarchical levels of said target* (paragraphs 79 & 83).

Regarding Dependent claims 12 and 28, Lau discloses *wherein said mapping scheme includes instructions on how to expand a number of hierarchical levels of said source to a greater number of hierarchical levels of said target* (paragraphs 79 & 83).

Regarding Dependent claims 13 and 29, Lau discloses *wherein at least one of the source and the target is a database* (paragraphs 67 & 69).

Regarding Dependent claims 14 and 30, Lau discloses *wherein at least one of the source and the target is an XML document* (paragraphs 67 & 69).

Regarding Dependent claims 15 and 31, Lau discloses *wherein said source is one of a database and an XML document and the target is the other of a database and an XML document* (paragraphs 67 & 69).

Regarding Dependent claims 16 and 32, Lau discloses *wherein the source is a*

first XML document and the target is a second XML document (paragraphs 67 &

69).

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any

interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all

it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in

the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Vedula et al. (U.S. 6,823,495) discloses "Mapping Tool Graphical User
  Interface"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571)

272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-

2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

February 3, 2006

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER